

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Although it is believed that the term "juxtaposed with" appropriately describes the side-by-side relationship of certain elements in the claims, the term has been changed to --adjacent to--. No changes in the drawings are necessary.

The claims have been amended, where appropriate, to overcome the claim objections. Moreover, the independent claims have been amended to clarify patentable distinctions between the inventions claimed and the prior art relied upon in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Incidentally, it is believed that numeral "(24)" in the text of the rejections should be --(44)--.

Independent Claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*, a plurality of spaced holding piece arms, extending radially outward from a corresponding partial portion of the periphery of a first end of a shank, and substantially in a same plane as the first end of the shank. See arms 13 and 13', for example.

Independent Claims 3 and 4 now recite, *inter alia*, at least one holding piece, extending outward from a corresponding partial portion of the periphery of a first end of the shank, and substantially in a same plane as the first end of the shank.

Independent Claim 7 now recites, *inter alia*, at least one holding piece arm projecting outward from the second end of the shank substantially in a same plane as the second end of the shank.

In *Rebers et al.*, the reference relied upon in the §102 rejection and the principal reference relied upon in the §103 rejection, arms 42a do not meet the requirements of the foregoing recitations in Claims 1 and 7. Moreover, contrary to the assertion in the rejection of Claim 6, arms 42a are not capable of being aligned with the first end of the shank of *Rebers et al.* Certainly, they are not substantially in the same plane as an end of the shank.

Dixon, the secondary reference relied upon in the §103 rejection, does not cure the deficiencies of *Rebers et al.*

Finally, features recited in the claims are neither taught nor suggested by *Rebers et al.* or *Rebers et al.* in combination with Dixon, and are what make possible the use

of the invention in applications such as those shown in Figs. 15 and 16, merely by way of example.

This application is now believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NHS:kss

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 903-9000

September 15, 2005

By: Nelson H. Shapiro
Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095